



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS  
SUITE 201  
3 LEAR JET  
LATHAM NY 12033

**COPY MAILED**

DEC 30 2004

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Rajendra Bera  
Application No.09/727,846  
Filed: December 1, 2000  
Title of Invention: METHOD OF  
DETERMINING THE SYNTACTIC  
CORRECTNESS OF EXPRESSIONS

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**ON PETITION**

This is a decision on the petition filed October 18, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.137(a).

The petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely submit a response to the Office Action mailed February 13, 2004. The notice set an extendable 2 month period for reply. No extensions of time pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on April 14, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed September 9, 2004.

Petitioner contends the Office Action was never received.

**Petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a)**

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply,<sup>1</sup>
- (2) the petition fee,
- (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable, and
- (4) a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed on or before June 8, 1995 or if the application is a design application.

The instant petition lacks items (3).

As to item (3), the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a).

The Office may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." See, 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a)(3). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business."); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case by case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2D 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

A review of the record indicates no irregularity in the mailing of the Notice, and in the absence of any irregularity in the mailing, there is a strong presumption that the Office action was properly mailed to the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the Notice was not in fact received. The showing required to establish the failure to receive an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement.<sup>2</sup> The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point

---

<sup>1</sup> In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

<sup>2</sup> M.P.E.P. § 711.03(c); See Notice entitled "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 O.G. 53 (November 16, 1993).

to a conclusion that the Office Action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office Action was lost in the mail.

A review of Office records shows the Office Action was mailed on February 13, 2004 to the correspondence address of record which was Ronald Drumheller of Mahopac, NY. This change of correspondence address was entered as a result of the request of attorney of record T. Rao Coca submitted on August 6, 2002. Accordingly any renewed petition should include a statement from T. Rao Coca that the Office Action was not received since petitioner was not the attorney of record when the Office Action was mailed. Further the Office is interested in the docket reports of T. Rao Coca, the attorney of record at the time the Office Action was mailed.

## Alternative Venue

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition to revive based on unintentional abandonment under 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required reply, the required petition fee, and a statement that the **entire** delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional.

The filing of a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed, and therefore, must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b).

**Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:**


**By mail:**

**Mail Stop Petition  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

By facsimile: (703) 872-9306

By delivery service: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
(FedEx, UPS, DHL, etc.) 220 20<sup>th</sup> Street S.  
Customer Window, Mail Stop Petition  
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03  
Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3215.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charlema R. Grant". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Charlema" being more prominent and the last name "Grant" following in a similar style.

Charlema R. Grant  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions